

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 07700 011523Z

44

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 126765

P 011324Z OCT 76

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3188

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 7700

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: HIGHLIGHTS, POST PLENARY DISCUSSIONS, SEPTEMBER 19, 1976
(SALT TWO - 1099)

1. (ROWNY/TRUSOV-BELETSKY, A-1410)

MIRV VERIFICATION

TRUSOV SAID THAT IF THE U.S. ACCEPTED THE SOVIET FORMULATIONS FOR ARTICLE II.5, WE COULD EXPECT THE SOVIETS TO AGREE TO A FURTHER STATEMENT CONCERNING MISSILES CURRENTLY EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS AS WELL AS THOSE TO BE SO EQUIPPED IN THE FUTURE. ROWNY TOLD TRUSOV THE U.S. COULD HARDLY ACCEPT THEIR FORMULATION FOR ARTICLE II.5 ON THE PROMISE THAT SOMETHING MIGHT BE WORKED OUT SUBSEQUENTLY.

ROWNY ASKED TRUSOV IF HE, ROWNY, HAD UNDERSTOOD SEMENOV'S STATEMENT CORRECTLY THAT ALL LAUNCHERS ASSOCIATED WITH SS-18'S WOULD BE COUNTED UNDER THE 1320 LIMITATION. TRUSOV SAID THAT ALL MISSILES "THE U.S. CALLS THE SS-18" COULD BE COONSIDERED AS MISSILES EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS. ROWNY PRESSED TRUSOV ON THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 07700 011523Z

POINT, REMINDING HIM THAT THE U.S. HAD SAID THAT THE SS-18

HAS BEEN FLIGHT-TESTED BOTH WITH MIRVS AND WITHOUT MIRVS AND THEREFORE ALL LAUNCHERS ASSOCIATED WITH SS-18'S WOULD BE CONSIDERED AS LAUNCHERS OF MIRVED MISSILES. TRUSOV REPEATED THAT ALL SS-18'S COULD BE CONSIDERED MIRVED MISSILES BUT AFTER SOME SPARRING "DID NOT DISAGREE" THAT LAUNCHERS FOR ALL "MISSILES THE U.S. CALLS SS-18" WOULD COUNT UNDER THE 1320 AGGREGATE.

ROWNY TOLD TRUSOV THAT WE HAD MENTIONED THE SS-18 ONLY AS AN EXAMPLE AND ASKED TRUSOV IF HE AGREED THAT THE SAME LOGIC APPLIED TO LAUNCHERS OF OTHER MISSILES WHICH HAVE BEEN TESTED BOTH WITH AND WITHOUT MIRVS. TRUSOV REFUSED TO ANSWER DIRECTLY, STATING THAT A CAREFUL STUDY OF THEIR STATEMENT WOULD CLEAR UP THIS ISSUE. HE ADDED THAT IN PART THE ANSWER COULD BE FOUND IN THEIR REPLIES TO OUR QUESTIONS CONCERNING DERAZHNYA AND PERVOMAYSK.

ROWNY ASKED IF THIS MEANT THAT SOME LAUNCHEERS AT DERAZHNYA AND PERVOMAYSK WOULD BE COUNTED UNDER THE 1320 AGGREGATE AND OTHERS WOULD NOT. TRUSOV SAID THIS WAS PRECISELY WHAT WAS MEANT.

2. (KLOSSON/KARPOV-SMOLIN, A-1413)

A. MIRV VERIFICATION

KARPOV BEGIN BY ALLEGING THAT THE AMERICAN QUESTIONS WITH REGARD TO DERAZHNYA AND PERVOMAYSYSK SHOWED THAT THE U.S. IN FACT HAD THE CAPABILITY TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN LAUNCHERS. KLOSSON REPLIED THAT THE FACT THAT THE USSR WAS WILLING TO COUNT ALL SS-18 MISSILES AS BEING MIRVED, ALTHOUGH SOME HAD ONLY A SINGLE REENTRY VEHICLE, SHOWED THAT THE USSR RECOGNIZED THE PROBLEM SET FORTH BY THE US.

B. MIRV CONVERSION

KLOSSON SAID THAT AS HE UNDERSTOOD THE SOVIET POSITION BOTH SIDES WERE IN AGREEMENT THAT ONCE NEW ACTIVITY BEGAN AT A LAUNCH SITE THE QUESTION WOULD ARISE WHETHER THIS ACTIVITY REFLECTED HARDENING OF THE LAUNCHER, OR ITS MODERNIZATION, OR ITS CONVERSION TO A LAUNCHER OF A MIRVED MISSILE. HE SAID THAT IS THE U.S. VIEW, ONCE IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THIS ACTIVITY

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 07700 011523Z

CONSTITUTES THE CONVERSION OF A LAUNCHER TO BECOME A LAUNCHER OF A MIRVED MISSILE, THAT LAUNCHER SHOULD THEREUPON COUNT WITHIN THE 1320 AGGREGATE. THE SOVIET POSITION SEEMED TO BE TO CALL FOR STILL ANOTHER STEP: THE DEPLOYMENT IN THAT LAUNCHER OF A MIRVED MISSILE.

KARPOV SAID THAT HE BELIEVED THE WAY TO PROCEED WOULD BE FOR THE SCC TO AGREE ON PROCEDURES REGARDING "HOW" CONVERSION

TAKES PLACE IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH WHEN TO COUNT A LAUNCHER
WITHIN THE 1320 AGGREGATE.

3. (IFFT-FREW/PAVLITCHENKO, A-1415)

A. MIRV VERIFICATION

IFFT REMARKED THAT THE SOVIET STATEMENT TODAY HAD BEEN
AN INTERESTING ONE. HE NOTED THE REFERENCE TO TESTING IN THE
NEW SOVIET TEXT FOR PARAGRAPH 5 OF ARTICLE II AND SAID THIS SEEMED
TO BE A STEP FORWARD. HE THEN SAID THAT THE SOVIET SIDE
APPEARED TO BE MOVING TOWARD A TYPE RULE OR SIMPLE CONCEPT.
PAVLITCHENKO SAID THAT THE U.S. APPROACH IS ARTIFICIAL AND
SOMEWHAT ACADEMIC.

IT WOULD OVERCOUNT SOVIET LAUNCHERS FOR MIRVED MISSILES. IFFT
AND FREW EXPLAINED THAT THE U.S. POSITION RESULTED FROM VERIFI-
CATION CONSIDERATIONS AND NOT FROM ANY DESIRE TO OVERCOUNT.
IFFT THEN NOTED THAT FLIGHT TESTING GENERALLY OCCURS FROM
LAUNCHERS AT TEST RANGES WHICH ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE AGGREGATE.
THUS THE SOVIET SIDE MUST HAVE IN MIND SOME CRITERION FOR MAKING
THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE TEST LAUNCHERS FROM WHICH THE TESTING
OCCURS AND THE LAUNCHERS IN THE FIELD WHICH ARE TO BE
COUNTED. PAVLITCHENKO AGREED AND SAID THAT, OF COURSE, THE
DEPLOYED LAUNCHERS COUNTED WOULD BE THOSE OF A "SIMILAR KIND"
TO THOSE OBSERVED IN TEXTING.

PAVLITCHENKO REFERRED TO DERAZHNYA AND PERVOMAYSK AS
AN EXAMPLE OF THE POSSIBLE OVERCOUNTING OF LAUNCHERS FOR MIRVED
MISSILES. HE SAID THAT COUNTING ALL OF THESE LAUNCHERS WOULD
OVERCOUNT "BY MANY TIMES" THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF LAUNCHERS FOR
MIRVED MISSILES AT THESE LOCATIONS. HE SAID THAT SOME MODERN-
IZATION WORK WAS GOING ON THERE AS WELL AS NEW CONSTRUCTION.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 SALT T 07700 011523Z

IFFT SAID THE U.S. SIDE HAD REFERRED TO THOSE TWO CATEGORIES
OF SILOS AND THE SOVIET SIDE TODAY HAD SAID THAT THERE WERE
TWO KINDS OF ICBMS DEPLOYED THERE - THOSE WITH MIRVS AND THOSE
WITHOUT. HE THEN SAID IT WOULD BE USEFUL IF THE SOVIET SIDE
COULD EXPLAIN WHETHER THE TWO KINDS OF ICBMS IT SAYS ARE THERE
ARE ASSOCIATED WITH THE TWO CATEGORIES OF SILOS OR WHETHER THEY
ARE DEPLOYED IN SOME OTHER WAY. PAVLITCHENKO SAID HE UNDERSTOOD
THE QUESTION, AND SAID THAT THEE "WOULD NOT BE AN OBSTACLE"
TO THE SOVIET SIDE'S PROVIDING FURTHER DATA ON DERAZHNYA AND
PERVOMAYSK AS THE SIDES MOVED LCOSER TO AGREEMENT.

B. DATA BASE

IFFT REMARKED THAT THE DISCUSSION ILLSUTRATED THE CONCEPT
OF A DATA BASE. PAVLITCHENKO REPLIED THAT AN ABSTRACT GENERAL

REQUEST FOR DATA IS NOT WELL-RECEIVED ON THE SOVIET SIDE AND CREATES PROBLEMS. HOWEVER, DATA RELATED TO SPECIFIC PROVISIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE AGREEMENT CAN BE VIEWED SOMEWHAT DIFFERENTLY. IFFT THEN ASKED WHETHER PAVLITCHENKO HAD IN MIND SOME SUGGESTIONS AS TO HOW THE DATA BASE CONCEPT COULD BE FORMULATED TO MAKE IT EASIER FOR THE SOVIET SIDE TO RESPOND FAVORABLY. PAVLITCHENKO THEN SAID THE U.S. PROPOSALS ARE NOT ALWAYS CLEAR - FOR EXAMPLE, WHAT DOES THE U.S. MEAN BY "CATEGORIES" OF DATA? IFFT REPLIED THAT THE U.S. IS NOT SEEKING A HIGH LEVEL OF DETAIL OR A LARGE SET OF NUMBERS. HE SAID THAT HE WAS SURE THE U.S. DELEGATION WOULD BE HAPPY TO CLARIFY THIS PROPOSAL IF THE SOVIET DELEGATION HAD QUESTIONS ABOUT IT.

4. (EARLE-HOWARD/SHCHUKIN, A-1408)

A. MIRV VERIFICATION

IN DISCUSSING SEMENOV'S PLENARY STATEMENT AND NEW SOVIET PROPOSAL FOR PARAGRAPH 5, ARTICLE II, EARLE SAID THAT AS HE READ IT, BEFORE A LAUNCHER WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE 1320 AGGREGATE IT WOULD HAVE TO MEET TWO CRITERIA: (1) IT WOULD HAVE TO BE "SUCH A LAUNCHER AS HAS BEEN TESTED FOR LAUNCHING MIRVS", AND (2) IT WOULD HAVE TO HAVE A MIRVED MISSILE DEPLOYED IN IT. IN THIS CONNECTION, EARLE ASKED WHAT WAS MEANT BY "SUCH LAUNCHERS AS HAVE BEEN TESTED".

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 05 SALT T 07700 011523Z

SHCHUKIN RESPONDED BY SAYING THAT ONCE AMIRV MISSILE HAD BEEN DEPLOYED IN A LAUNCHER, THAT LAUNCHER WOULD COUNT EVEN IF THE MISSILE WERE REMOVED FOR REPAIRS, ETC. EARLE SAID HE UNDERSTOOD THIS FROM PREVIOUS STATEMENTS OF THE SOVIET DELEGATION BUT WISHED TO HAVE "TESTED" AMPLIFIED. SHCHUKIN RESPONDED BY ASKING IF EARLE AGREED WITH HIM THAT FOR A LAUNCHER TO BE INCLUDED IN THE 1320 AGGREGATE IT NEED NOT HAVE LAUNCHED A MIRVED MISSILE. EARLE AGREED EMPHATICALLY.

HOWARD ASKED IF THE LAUNCHER WOULD MEET THE FIRST CRITERION IF "SUCH A LAUNCHER" HAD BEEN TESTED WITH A MIRVED MISSILE AT SOME OTHER SITE SUCH AS TEST RANGE. SHCHUKIN DID NOT DENY THIS, BUT AGAIN SAID THE MATTER SHOULD BE REFERRED TO THE DRAFTING GROUP.

B. DESIGNATION OF SS-18 AS MIRVED/DATA BASE

SHCHUKIN SAID THE SOVIET DESIGNATION OF THE SS-18 AS MIRVED WAS JUST ONE STEP AT THE BEGINNING OF A ROAD.

HOWARD ASKED IF THE SOVIET DECLARATION THAT SS-18S WERE MIRVED MISSILES COULD BE FOLLOWED BY QUANTITATIVE INFORMATION

ON MIRV TOTALS OF OTHER MISSILES. SHCHUKIN REPLIED THAT IT WAS POSSIBLE; THE SOVIETS WOULD CONSIDER IDENTIFYING A NUMBER TO BE COUNTED AGAINST THE 1320 AGGREGATE, AGAIN CONTINGENT ON U.S. ACCEPTANCE OF THE NEW ARTICLE II.5.

SHCHUKIN WARNED HOWARD NOT TO INFER SOVIET ACCEPTANCE OF THE DATA-BASE PROPOSAL FROM HIS WILLINGNESS TO DISCUSS IT. NONETHELESS, SHCHUKIN TWICE SUGGESTED THAT, BY CONFINING OUR QUESTIONS TO SPECIFICS, AS IN THE CASE OF DERAZHNYA AND PER-VOMAYSK, QUANTITATIVE DATA COULD BE FORTHCOMING. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: SALT (ARMS CONTROL), ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, MEETING REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 01 OCT 1976
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: greeneet
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976SALTT07700
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760370-0850
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19761092/aaaadbzk.tel
Line Count: 233
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: greeneet
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 05 NOV 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <06 FEB 2004 by GarlanWA>; WITHDRAWN <29 SEP 2004 by saccheem, REFER TO OSD>; RELEASED <05 NOV 2004 by ElyME>; APPROVED <05 NOV 2004 by greeneet>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: HIGHLIGHTS, POST PLENARY DISCUSSIONS, SEPTEMBER 19, 1976 (SALT TWO - 1099)
TAGS: PARM, US, UR
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006